



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,275	03/28/2007	Ryozo Nagai	P30563	2170
7055 7590 03/30/2010 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191				
EXAMINER				
PURDY, KYLE A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1611				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/30/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com  
pto@gbpatent.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/598,275

**Applicant(s)**

NAGAI ET AL.

**Examiner**

Kyle Purdy

**Art Unit**

1611

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S&C/22)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1 sheet (09/21/2009)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**  
***Election Acknowledged***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the species of arteriosclerosis in the reply filed on 01/21/2010 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the claims, as amended, overcome the election requirement. The Examiner agrees, and the aforementioned requirement is withdrawn.

2. The requirement is deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

***Status of Application***

3. The Examiner acknowledges receipt of the amendments filed on 01/21/2010 wherein claims 22 and 23 have been amended.

4. Claims 22-32 are presented for examination on the merits. The following rejections are made.

5. It's noted that Applicant has shifted the focus of their invention from composition to treatment method.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**9. Claims 22-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marx et al. (Circ. Res., 2002, 90, 703-170) in view of Shidoji et al. (WO01/80854; published 04/23/2001) as evidenced by the English equivalent, US 2005/0250671.**

10. Marx is directed to PPAR activators as anti-inflammatory mediators in human T lymphocytes. It's taught that activation of T lymphocytes and their ensuing elaboration of proinflammatory cytokines represents a critical step in atherogenesis and arteriosclerosis (see abstract). Marx also teaches that these proinflammatory cytokines are also integral to the development of transplantation-associated arteriosclerosis (Tx-AA) (see abstract). Marx shows that activation of PPAR results in marked reduction in cytokine mRNA expression and thus activation of PPAR limits the expression of proinflammatory cytokines yielding potential therapeutic benefits in pathological process like atherosclerosis and Tx-AA (see abstract). Marx is directed to PPAR activation in humans.

11. Marx fails to teach the administration of a polyprenylcarboxylic acid compound, specifically 3,7,11,15-tetramethyl-2,4,6,10,14 hexadecapentanoic acid (THA), as being a PPAR activator for treatment of arteriosclerosis.

12. Shidoji (the English equivalent) is directed to activators of peroxisome proliferative-activated receptors comprising the polyprenylcarboxylic compound, THA. It's taught that THA effectively activates PPAR (see [0009], Example 2 and [0028]). Shidoji teaches that THA is suitable for oral administration and may be combined with pharmaceutical carriers (additives) such as lactose and glucose (see [0019]). Shidoji teaches that THA is suitable for human consumption (see [0021]).

13. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Marx with Shidoji with a reasonable expectation for success in arriving at a method of treating arteriosclerosis by administering a polyprenylcarboxylic acid such as THA. Marx teaches that PPAR activation results in significant reduction in proinflammatory cytokines. Moreover, Tx-AA is characterized by smooth muscle cell proliferation, which is believed to be driven by cytokine and cytokine-induced growth factors. PPAR activation may oppose this response as the anti-inflammatory effects of PPAR activation on T lymphocytes contribute to decreased Tx-AA in patients. Although Marx fails to teach administering THA to elicit a PPAR response and treat arteriosclerosis, any ordinary person would have been capable of arriving at such. Shidoj teaches that THA is an excellent PPAR activator and can be administered orally with other pharmaceutical additives. Thus, an ordinary person would be motivated to select and administer THA on subjects with arteriosclerosis with a reasonable expectation in treating the said condition. With respect to the

limitations that administration of the polyprenylcarboxylic acid treating arteriosclerosis such that activation of transcription factor KLF5 and vascular remodeling is inhibited, these are interpreted by the Examiner as inherent properties of administering polyprenylcarboxylic acid to treat arteriosclerosis. In other word, administering a polyprenylcarboxylic acid to a subject to treat arteriosclerosis would necessarily have the biological benefits espoused by Applicant, i.e. inhibition of KLF5 and vascular remodeling. Artisans of ordinary skill may not recognize the inherent characteristics or functions of the prior art. However, the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. With respect to the limitation that the arteriosclerosis be due to vascular injury, wherein the vascular injury is the result of reconstructive surgery, this limitation is met by Marx because Marx teaches that arteriosclerosis may be associated with transplantation surgery, i.e. reconstructive surgery. Regardless, the means by which arteriosclerosis is formed is immaterial to the claim. Absent secondary considerations, it's the position of the Examiner that arteriosclerosis is arteriosclerosis, regardless of what caused it. In other words, arteriosclerosis caused by vascular surgery would be expected to be identical to arteriosclerosis not caused by vascular surgery, and therefore treatment with a polyprenylcarboxylic acid would reasonably be expected to treat each. Therefore, a method of administering a polyprenylcarboxylic acid for the treatment of arteriosclerosis is *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in absence of evidence to the contrary.

***Conclusion***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle A. Purdy whose telephone number is 571-270-3504. The examiner can normally be reached from 9AM to 5PM.

15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila Landau, can be reached on 571-272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*/Kyle Purdy/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1611  
March 16, 2010*

*/Sharmila Gollamudi Landau/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1611*

Application/Control Number: 10/598,275  
Art Unit: 1611

Page 7